



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,679	08/14/2006	Jean Plouet	BJS-1487-28	7452
23117	7590	10/31/2007	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			LOCKARD, JON MCCLELLAND	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR				
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,679	PLOUET ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	/	
Jon M. Lockard	1647		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) 10-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 10-14 and 18, in so far as they are drawn to a method of treatment comprising administering a polypeptide.

Group 2, claim(s) 10 and 18, in so far as they are drawn to a method of treatment comprising administering a polynucleotide.

Group 3, claim(s) 10 and 18, in so far as they are drawn to a method of treatment comprising administering an antibody.

Group 4, claim(s) 15-17, in so far as they are drawn to polypeptides and pharmaceutical compositions comprising the same.

Group 5, claim(s) 15, in so far as it is drawn to polynucleotides and pharmaceutical compositions comprising the same.

Group 6, claim(s) 15, in so far as it is drawn to antibodies and pharmaceutical compositions comprising the same.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Group I is directed to a method of treatment comprising administering the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2. However, since Hastings et al. (US Pat. No. 5,780,263, published 14 July 1998) teach a polypeptide (SEQ ID NO:17) that shares 100% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2 as well as methods of treatment comprising administering said polypeptide, no special technical feature exists for group I as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, because it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Because the technical feature of Group I is not a special technical feature, and because the technical features of the

Art Unit: 1647

Groups II-VI inventions is not present in the Group I claims, unity of invention is lacking. Furthermore, the polypeptides of Group IV, the polynucleotides of Group V, and the antibodies of Group VI are structurally and functionally different chemical compounds, having different structures and activities, and each of which can be made and used without the other compounds. The methods of Groups I, II, and III require compounds which are functionally different from each other and each can be made and used without the other. Lack of unity is shown because these compounds lack a common utility which is based upon a common structural feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Further Restriction Within Groups I-VI

3. Whichever Group is elected, further restriction within the elected Group is required to one of the following:

Applicants must further elect *one* polypeptide and the corresponding nucleic acid that encodes said polypeptide selected from SEQ ID NO2: (encoded by SEQ ID NO:1), SEQ ID NO:4 (encoded by SEQ ID NO:3), SEQ ID NO:6 (encoded by SEQ ID NO:5), or SEQ ID NO:8 (encoded by SEQ ID NO:7)

4. The polypeptides and polynucleotide molecules do not relate to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each polypeptide and polynucleotide molecule represents a structurally and functionally different chemical compound from each other, having different chromosomal locations and sequences for the nucleic acids, and having different amino acid sequences, structures and activities for the polypeptides, each of which can be made and used without the other compounds. Accordingly, the methods of using the compounds are also, therefore, different methods. Lack of unity is shown because these compounds and methods lack a common utility which is based upon a common structural feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Art Unit: 1647

5. **Applicants are advised that this is not a species election.**

6. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

(1) age-related macular degeneration, (2) diabetic retinopathy, (3) rheumatoid arthritis, (4) angiomas, (5) angiosarcomas, (6) allograft and xenograft rejection, (7) acrocyanosis, (8) scleroderma, (9) preparation of grafts between collection and transplantation, and (10) cancer.

7. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

8. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

9. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species 1: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 2: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 3: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 4: Claims 10-13 and 18

Art Unit: 1647

Species 5: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 6: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 7: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 8: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 9: Claims 10-13 and 18

Species 10: Claim 14

The following claim(s) are generic: no claim is generic.

10. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: they are distinct medical conditions having different etiologies and effects, and therefore cannot constitute a unifying technical feature.

11. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

12. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be

Art Unit: 1647

amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

13. **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

14. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

15. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

16. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1647

17. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Advisory Information

Effective November 1, 2007, if applicant wishes to present more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims in an application, applicant will be required to file an examination support document (ESD) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 before the first Office action on the merits (hereafter "5/25 claim threshold"). See Changes to Practice for Continued Examination Filings, Patent Applications Containing Patentably Indistinct Claims, and Examination of Claims in Patent Applications, 72 Fed. Reg. 46715 (Aug. 21, 2007), 1322 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 76 (Sept. 11, 2007) (final rule). The changes to 37 CFR 1.75(b) apply to any pending applications in which a first Office action on the merits (FAOM) has not been mailed before November 1, 2007. Withdrawn claims will not be taken into account in determining whether an application exceeds the 5/25 claim threshold. For more information on the final rule, please see <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/presentation/clmcontfinalrule.html>.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in this Office action, applicant is required to file an election responsive to the restriction requirement. Applicant may not file a suggested restriction requirement (SRR) in lieu of an election responsive to the restriction requirement as a reply. A SRR alone will not be considered a *bona-fide* reply to this Office action.

If applicant elects an invention that is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims, applicant will not be required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims. If the elected invention is drawn to more than 5

Art Unit: 1647

independent claims or more than 25 total claims, applicant may file an amendment canceling a number of elected claims so that the elected invention would be drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims.

If the restriction requirement is mailed on or after November 1, 2007, applicant is also required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims, unless the elected invention is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims. To avoid the abandonment of the application, the ESD (if required) and the election must be filed within **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this Office action. The two-month time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136.

If the restriction requirement is mailed before November 1, 2007, the election must be filed within **ONE MONTH** or **THIRTY DAYS**, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this Office action. The time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136. Furthermore, if the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims, the Office will notify applicant and provide a time period in which applicant is required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 covering each of the elected claims or amend the application to contain no more than 5 independent elected claims and no more than 25 total elected claims.

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jon M. Lockard** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2717**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Manjunath N. Rao**, can be reached on **(571) 272-0939**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).



Jon M. Lockard, Ph.D.
October 26, 2007